

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office action mailed January 31, 2007. With the cancellation of claims 61-62 and 64-69, and the addition of claims 82-93, Claims 1-60 and 82-93 are presented herewith for consideration.

The undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Supervising Examiner for his time in conducting a telephonic interview in the above-identified patent application on February 6, 2007. In view of the points made by the undersigned attorney during that Interview, the Supervising Examiner acknowledged that Schrire does not support a rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102. The Supervising Examiner indicated that the stated rejection over Schrire would be removed and that a further search of the art would be performed.

I. Rejection of Claims 61-62 and 64-69 under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 61-62 and 64-69 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because:

One or more processor, hence “Non-functional descriptive material.

While this statement in support of the rejection makes no grammatical or syntactical sense, and while applicants respectfully submit that claims 61-62 and 64-69 are not objectionable under 35 U.S.C. §101, applicants have canceled claims 61-62 and 64-69 from the application to expedite allowance of the remaining claims.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection on these grounds be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-15, 17, 20-45, 48-62 and 64-69 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-15, 17, 20-45, 48-62 and 64-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0235523 to Schrire et al. (“Schrire”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for reasons which are of record in prior responses. The Supervising Examiner has indicated that these reasons are sufficient to remove the rejection of these claims over Schrire. Applicants have made amendments to certain claims for clarification purposes. These amendments are unrelated to the patentability of the claims (as indicated, prior to any amendment, the claims were patentable over the art of record).

The Examiner has indicated that the scheduling back-up interface was shown by the “scheduler” disclosed in Schrire at paragraphs 77, 96, 84 and 102. This scheduler from Schrire is unrelated to a user interface for setting up a backup schedule.

In view of the above and the reasons of record, it is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-15, 17, 20-45, 48-60 on the stated grounds be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claim 16 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrire in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,728,530 to Heinonen et al. (“Heinonen”). As indicated in responses of record, claim 16 includes several limitations found in claim 1 which are nowhere disclosed, taught or suggested in Schrire. Heinonen adds nothing to the teaching of Schrire in regard to any of these limitations. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted claim 16 is not taught or suggested in the cited references, taken alone or in combination with each other.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 18-19 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrire in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0192260 to Sugimoto et al. (“Sugimoto”). As indicated in responses of record, claims 18 and 19 include several limitations found in claim 1 which are nowhere disclosed, taught or suggested in Schrire. Sugimoto adds nothing to the teaching of Schrire in regard to any of these limitations. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted claims 18 and 19 are not taught or suggested in the cited references, taken alone or in combination with each other.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claims 46-47 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 46-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrire in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0192282 to Vasudevan (“Vasudevan”). As indicated in responses of record, claims 46 and 47 include several limitations found in claim 42 which are nowhere disclosed, taught or suggested in Schrire. Vasudevan adds nothing to the

teaching of Schrire in regard to any of these limitations. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted claims 46 and 47 are not taught or suggested in the cited references, taken alone or in combination with each other.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 46-47 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

VI. New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 82-93 directed to a user interface. No new matter has been added.

Based on the above remarks, reconsideration of claims 1-60, and consideration of claims 82-93, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 7, 2007

By: /Brian I. Marcus/
Brian I. Marcus
Reg. No. 34,511

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP
575 Market Street, Suite 2500
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665